

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on August 4, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 4, 9-13, 16, 26, 30, 41, 42, 48 and 55 are amended, no claims are newly canceled or added; as a result, claims 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57 and 60-63 remain pending in this application.

#### **Objection to the Specification**

On page 2 of the non-Final Office Action of August 4, 2006, the specification was objected to because a reference to United States Patent Application Serial No. 09/055,772, on page 2 of the specification, did not indicate that the application was patented. By this Amendment, page 2 of the specification is amended to indicate that United States Patent Application Serial No. 09/055,772 was issued as United States Patent No. 6,336,912 on April 2, 2002. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

#### **Double Patenting Rejection**

On page 3 of the non-Final Office Action, claims 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-77, and 60-63 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U. S. Patent No. 6,366,912 to Wallent et al. (“Wallent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,010,681 to Fletcher et al. (“Fletcher”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Further, Applicant wishes to point out that the rejection should not have been a provisional rejection because the conflicting claims have been patented, contrary to the statement of item 13 on page 3 of the non-Final Office Action.

Page 3 of the non-Final Office Action states that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Wallent with Fletcher to further protect the system of Wallent from downloaded content. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Wallent relates to network browsing software and, in particular, to methods and systems for providing security when accessing network sites (see Wallent, at col. 1, lines 4-6). Wallent, at col. 2, lines 10-19, discloses that some software components transferred over the World Wide Web perform undesired operations, such as malicious operations. Thus, Wallent addresses the

above-mentioned problem by configuring a Web browser to establish multiple security zones, wherein each security zone corresponds to a set of Web sites (Wallent, at col. 2, lines 55-57). Each zone has a corresponding set of security settings that indicate actions to be performed when a corresponding protected operation is to be performed in response to receiving a Web document (Wallent, at col. 2, lines 57-60). For example, the Web browser may perform a protected operation or prevent the performance of the protected operation in accordance with a corresponding security setting (Wallent, at col. 3, lines 6-10). Thus, Applicant submits that Wallent is concerned with protecting a processing device from malicious operation based on a level of trust of a source that provides content to the Web browser.

Fletcher addresses a completely different problem. Fletcher is related to encryption, and in particular, a method, system and apparatus for selecting encryption levels based on policy profiling and client device capabilities (Fletcher, at col. 2, lines 31-34). Fletcher discloses filtering out sections within a document if a user is not authorized to see the sections, or the device is not sufficiently secure to receive the sections (Fletcher, at col. 3, lines 6-8). Fletcher discloses encrypting remaining sections within the document using a selected encryption mechanism (Fletcher, at col. 3, lines 8-12). Thus, Applicant submits that Fletcher is concerned with the disclosure of sensitive information only to authorized individuals using devices capable of providing a required level of protection or encryption. Further, Applicant submits that Fletcher discloses that documents are received from a document database (see Fletcher, at col. 4, lines 26-27). Because Fletcher discloses that documents are retrieved from a known source, the document database, Fletcher is not concerned with protecting a device for viewing documents from malicious code.

Wallent is concerned with protecting the system from downloaded content. As discussed above, Fletcher is concerned with the disclosure of sensitive information to unauthorized users, and is not concerned with protecting the system from downloaded content. Therefore, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Wallent with Fletcher to further protect the system of Wallent from downloaded content, as suggested on page 3 of the non-Final Office Action..

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57 and 60-63 be withdrawn.

*§102 Rejection of the Claims*

On page 4 of the non-Final Office Action, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 55, 56 and 60-62 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Fletcher. Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 55 obviate the rejection. Claims 4, 9 and 10 were amended only to better conform with claim 1.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method in a computer system. The method includes, among other things, controlling page output and any actions corresponding to at least part of a content by: 1) interpreting at least one part of a page based on a first set of security settings, the first set of security settings being based on an identifier indicating a source from which the page is obtained; and 2) interpreting at least one other part of the page based on a second set of security settings associated with an element of the page, the second set of security settings being different from the first set.

Fletcher discloses a librarian process that passes an author's name to a personnel database, receives the author's role in the company as a response, and maps the author's role and a security tag to absolute levels of security (Fletcher, at col. 4, lines 32-47). Although one may consider the author to be a source of content included in a page, the author cannot be the source from which a page is obtained. Applicant submits that Fletcher is completely silent with respect to disclosing or suggesting a set of security settings being based on an identifier indicating a source from which a page is obtained, as required by amended independent claim 1.

Because Fletcher does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Fletcher and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 9-10, 12 and 17 depend from claim 1 and are not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-6, 9-10, 12 and 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 18 is not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 55 is directed to a markup language document. The markup language document includes, among other things, a first set of content associated with a first set

of security settings, wherein the first set of security settings is based on an identifier indicating a source on a network or a local computer from which the first set of content is obtained.

Applicant submits that, at least for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1, Fletcher is completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of a first set of content associated with a first set of security settings, wherein the first set of security settings is based on an identifier indicating a source on a network or a local computer from which the first set of content is obtained, as required by amended independent claim 55.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submit that Fletcher fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 55. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 55 be withdrawn.

Claims 56 and 60-62 depend from claim 55 and are not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 55. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 56 and 60-62 be withdrawn.

#### *§103 Rejection of the Claims*

On page 8 of the non-Final Office Action, claims 7-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 57 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fletcher. Applicant submits that amended independent claims 1 and 55 obviate the rejection. Claims 11 and 13 were amended to better conform with claim 1, from which claims 11 and 13 depend. Claim 16 was amended to depend from claim 14, instead of claim 13.

Claims 7, 8, 11, 13-14 and 16 depend from claim 1, which is not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 7, 8, 11, 13-14 and 16 are patentable over Fletcher for at least these reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7, 8, 11, 13-14 and 16 be withdrawn.

Claim 57 depends from claim 55, which is not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 55. Applicant submits that claim 57 is patentable over Fletcher for at least these reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 57 be withdrawn.

On page 9 of the non-Final Office Action, claims 15 and 63 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fletcher, and further in view of Edwards, "The

Guide to Internet Security Zones” (“Edwards”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 15 was amended to depend from claim 14, instead of claim 13.

Similar to Wallent, Edwards is concerned with security zones and preventing certain Web-based applications for performing unauthorized actions with a Web browser (see Edwards, a page 1). That is, like Wallent, Edwards is concerned with protecting a processing device from potentially dangerous Internet sites (see Edwards, at paragraph following heading “Configuring Security Zones”).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must meet three criteria. First, there must be some motivation or suggestion, either in the references themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and finally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The Examiner bears the initial burden of providing some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." MPEP 2142.

For reasons similar to those discussed above, with respect to claim 1 and the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of that claim, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Fletcher with Edwards. Therefore, the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 15 and 63 be withdrawn.

Claims 26-30 and 32-48 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher (U.S. 7,010,681), and further in view of Snell, “SAMS Teach Yourself the Internet in 24 Hours” (“Snell”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As mentioned previously, with respect to claim 1, Fletcher is concerned with protecting sensitive information, such that the sensitive information will be disclosed only to authorized individuals using devices capable of providing a required level of protection or encryption. As mentioned previously, with respect to claim 1, because Fletcher discloses that documents are

retrieved from a known source, Fletcher is not concerned with protecting one's computer from malicious code.

Snell discloses using security zones. Snell, at Hour 8, in the section entitled, "Understanding Zone Security Settings", states:

The security settings for a zone determine how aggressive the security system in Internet Explorer will be when communicating with Web sites in that zone. There are four standard security levels: Low, Medium-Low, Medium, and High. For example, you can always view pages on any site, regardless of security settings. (To completely block access to particular sites, use Internet Explorer's Content Advisor, as described in Hour 21.) But within a zone for which high security is in effect, if a server attempts to send a script or other program code that could give your computer a virus or other problem, Internet Explorer prevents the code from reaching your computer.

Thus, Snell discloses that one can always view pages on any site, regardless of security settings, but that a browser, such as Internet Explorer, may prevent malicious code from a Web site from reaching one's computer.

Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Fletcher, which is concerned with preventing disclosure of sensitive information to unauthorized individuals and is not concerned with protecting a computer from malicious code, with Snell, which is concerned with protecting a computer from malicious code, but does not prevent one from viewing pages on a site.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that the Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 26-30 and 32-48. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 26-30 and 32-48 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (425-707-9382) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500463.

Respectfully submitted,  
**Microsoft Corporation**  
Customer No. 22971

Date December 13, 2006

By Richard C. Irving  
Richard C. Irving  
Reg. No. 38,499

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 20 day of December, 2006.

Laura Bray

Name

Laura Bray

Signature